

P20832.A03

- IV Claims 19-24, drawn to a method for reordering a decode order into a display order of an image, classified in class 348, subclass 409.1; and
- V Claims 25 and 26, drawn to an apparatus for reordering a decode order into a display order of an image, classified in class 375, subclass 240.25.

Upon entry of the present paper, Applicant will have elected, with traverse, Invention I comprising claims 1-6.

Applicant respectfully traverses the above Restriction Requirement and submit that it is inappropriate, and requests that each of the claims be examined in the instant application, pursuant to the guidelines set forth in M.P.E.P. § 803. That is, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his requirement and find that there would not appear to be "a serious burden" on the Office in also examining the claims directed toward the non-elected inventions, which would otherwise be withdrawn from consideration if the election requirement is maintained.

Applicant respectfully submits that in spite of the Examiner's restriction analysis, the non-elected claims should be examined in the instant application for the following reasons. It would appear that the search for the inventions identified by the Examiner would be coextensive, or at least have significant overlap. For example, claim 1 of Group I, claim 7 of Group II, claim 13 of Group III and claim 19 of Group IV each share common subject matter. Specifically, claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 are each drawn to a method for reordering a decode order into a display order of an image, including at least determining a first picture of a compressed picture sequence. Thus, at least the search for the claims of Groups I, II, III and IV would appear to be coextensive.

Additionally, the search for Groups I-IV and for Group V, would appear to be coextensive. Specifically, while Groups I-IV are directed to a methods for reordering a decode order into a display

P20832.A03

order of an image, Group V is directed to an apparatus that performs this process. Thus, it appears that the search for Groups I-V would be coextensive.

Further, as set forth in M.P.E.P. § 803 and discussed *supra*, the Examiner must set forth the existence of “a serious burden” if the Restriction Requirement were not required. Applicant submits that the Examiner has not addressed the required issue of “serious burden.” Thus, for at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that the restriction between Groups I-V should be withdrawn.

Because the search for Groups I-V would be coextensive, there would be no serious burden on the Examiner to examine all of the claims of this application. For this reason, consistent with office policy as set forth in M.P.E.P. § 803, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the Election Requirement. For the foregoing reasons, the Election Requirement in this application is believed improper and it is respectfully submitted that it be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Nevertheless, in order to be fully responsive, Applicant has elected with traverse the invention disclosed in Group I comprising claims 1-6, in the event that the Examiner chooses not to reconsider and withdraw the Restriction Requirement.

P20832.A03

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned
at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Chi-Cheng JU

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Will. Boshnick".

William Boshnick
Reg. No. 44,550

July 7, 2003
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191